Comment on 'Non-existence of the Luttinger-Ward functional and misleading convergence of skeleton diagrammatic series for Hubbard-like models'

R. Eder
Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, Institut für Festkörperphysik, 76021 Karlsruhe, Germany
(Dated: July 25, 2014)

The known analytical properties of the Green's function and self-energy rule out an ambiguity of the self-energy. The noninteracting Green's functions obtained by Kozik *et al.* in arxive:1407.5687 likely have pathological properties.

PACS numbers: 71.10.-w,71.10.Fd,02.70.Ss

arXiv:1407.6599v1 [cond-mat.str-el] 24 Jul 2014

In a recent publication[1] Kozik *et al.* studied the problem of reconstructing the noninteracting Green's function $G_0(\omega)$ and self-energy $\Sigma(\omega)$ of various models from the known exact Green's function $G(\omega)$. The method employed was to start from a given 'trial $G_0(\omega)$' input this into a Quantum Monte Carlo solver, compute the resulting $G[G_0](\omega)$ and enforce $G[G_0](\omega) = G(\omega)$ by iterative improvement of G_0. They found that depending on details of the iterative procedure they could obtain different pairs (G_0, Σ) which give the same G, whereby Σ is the (numerically) exact self-energy obtained by the solver for the noninteracting Green's function G_0. They concluded, that no unique mapping $G \to \Sigma$ exists so that the Luttinger-Ward functional $\Phi[G]$ is non-existent.
However, under the physically reasonable assumption that $G_0^{-1}(\omega)$ be analytical the known analytical forms of the Green's function and self-energy rule out any ambiguity of Σ and hence G_0.
Luttinger[2] derived the following form of the self-energy:

$$\Sigma(\omega) = \eta + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{\sigma_i}{\omega - \zeta_i} \tag{1}$$

with real η, $\sigma_i > 0$ and ζ_i. Equation (1) follows directly from the Lehmann-representation for Green's function

$$G(\omega) = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \frac{Z_i}{\omega - \omega_i} \tag{2}$$

where $Z_i > 0$ and ω_i are real. On the real axis, $G(\omega)$ crosses zero once in each interval $[\omega_i : \omega_{i+1}]$ with negative slope. Assuming G_0^{-1} to be analytical this implies a divergence of $\Sigma(\omega)$, hence the ζ_i equal the zeroes of $G(\omega)$ and the number of poles of $\Sigma(\omega)$ is one less than the number of poles of $G(\omega)$ (all of this is well-known in the literature). For analytical $G_o^{-1}(\omega)$ one has near a given ζ_i

$$G^{-1}(\omega) = -\frac{\sigma_i}{\omega - \zeta_i} + c_0 + c_1(\omega - \zeta_i) + \dots$$

with real constants c_0 and c_1 and omitted terms are of higer order in $\omega - \zeta_i$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} G(\omega) &= -\frac{\omega - \zeta_i}{\sigma_i} - \frac{c_0}{\sigma_i^2}(\omega - \zeta_i)^2 + \dots, \\ \frac{dG(\omega)}{d\omega}|_{\omega=\zeta_i} &= -\frac{1}{\sigma_i}. \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumption that G_0^{-1} be analytical all σ_i and ζ_i thus are completely determined by the zeroes of $G(\omega)$ and its slope at these. The additive constant η is the Hartee-Fock potential[3] which can be expressed as a functional of $G(\omega)$ and thus is determined uniquely by $G(\omega)$ as well. One might worry about an 'information mismatch' because G involves $2n+2$ parameters whereas Σ involves only $2n+1$ - however, one constant in G is absorbed by the requirement $\sum_i Z_i = 1$. To summarize the discussion so far: if one imposes the rigorously known analytic structure of $G(\omega)$ and $\Sigma(\omega)$ and the analyticity of $G_0^{-1}(\omega) = \omega + \mu - H_0$ there is exactly one self-energy and - by the Dyson equation - exactly one G_0^{-1} for each physical $G(\omega)$ (whereby for a physical $G(\omega)$ the equation $G_0^{-1}(\omega) - \Sigma(\omega) = 0$ must be obeyed for all ω_i).
The above discussion suggests that the solutions obtained by Kozik *et al.* have a nonanalytical $G_0^{-1}(\omega)$ and this indeed becomes apparent in their Figure 3, where for $U = 4$ the self-energy for the unphysical solution does not diverge as $\omega \to 0$. One the other hand one knows that

$$\begin{aligned} G^{-1}(\omega) &= G_0^{-1}(\omega) - \Sigma(\omega) \\ &= -\frac{U^2}{4\omega}\left(1 - \frac{4\omega^2}{U^2}\right) \end{aligned}$$

so if $\Sigma(\omega)$ stays regular at $\omega \to 0$ necessarily $G_0^{-1}(\omega) \to -\frac{U^2}{4\omega}$. To see the consequence let us assume that the regular part of $G_0^{-1}(\omega)$ has the simplest form compatible with particle-hole symmetry and the requirement that $G_0(\omega) \to 1/\omega$ for large $|\omega|$ whence

$$G_0(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \frac{U^2}{4\omega}},$$

which would be the exact, fully interacting Green's function. This suggests that the solutions obtained by Kozik *et al.* correspond to a 'noninteracting Green's function' which up to slight deviations is equal to the fully interacting one and a small 'self energy' which undoes these slight deviations.
While in the absence of precise information on the G_0 found by Kozik *et al.* this is somewhat speculative it should be noted that the fact that these authors may be using a slightly modified fully interacting Green's function as their noninteracting Green's function, might pro-

vide a rather natural explanation for the 'misleading convergence of the skeleton series'. Namely in their Figure 3c Kozik *et al.* are comparing self-energies obtained in two different ways:
1) A 'noninteracting Green's function' which likely is close to the exact interacting one and in particular already has the two Hubbard bands, is used as input in a quantum Monte Carlo solver and a self-energy is obtained, which necessarily can only be a small correction anymore.
2) The exact interacting Green's function which also has the two Hubbard bands is inserted into a low order skeleton-diagram expansion for the self-energy. Since particle-hole excitations have to cross the Hubbard gap, the resulting self-energy also must be small.
That the self-energies obtained in this way show some similarity then may not be surprising.

[1] E. Kozik, M. Ferrero, and A. Georges, arXiv:1407.5687 (2011).
[2] J. M. Luttinger, Phys. Rev. **121**, 942 (1961).
[3] R. Eder, K. Seki, and Y. Ohta, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 205137